

### REMARKS

With the above amendments, claims 1-34 remain in the application and stand rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following reasons.

#### Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,737 to Landsman et al. ("Landsman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,553 to Cragun et al. ("Cragun"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is patentable over Landsman and Cragun at least for reciting: "detecting the presence of the window-blocking mechanism in a computer; and automatically disabling the window-blocking mechanism in response to the detection of the window-blocking mechanism." Landsman merely discloses an advertising delivery system over the Internet (Cragun, Abstract). As noted in the last office action, "Landsman does not disclose a method of removing an advertisement blocker." However, the last office action asserts that "if an advertisement blocker is enabled on a client browser, Landsman is essentially motivated to develop a strategy to overcome the advertisement blocker" (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully disagree with this conclusion. There is no teaching or suggestion from either Landsman, Cragun, or other reference to support this conclusion. The last office action fails to provide documentary evidence to support this conclusion. Conventional advertising providers on the Internet do not defeat window-blocking mechanisms, nor have the means to do so. Not to mention that Landsman does not even talk about a window blocking mechanism.

Cragun does not disclose or teach how to automatically disable a window-blocking mechanism in response to detection of the window-blocking mechanism. Cragun discloses a browser with an object blocker, but the browser does not automatically disable itself in response to detecting itself (if that feature even makes sense at all). Put another way, Cragun teaches object blocking, not how to defeat a

window blocking mechanism. Window blocking is the opposite of defeating a window blocker, so Cragun does not in any way render claim 1 unpatentable.

Cragun provides a way for a user to manually enter the URLs of objects to be blocked for configuration purposes. Doing so does not "defeat" the object blocker, but merely configures it. For example, Cragun's browser does not automatically block objects in response to detection of itself.

Therefore, even if Landsman and Cragun can be combined for the sake of argument (it cannot be combined as described below), the combination would still fail to meet every limitation of claim 1.

Another problem with the Landsman/Cragun combination is how the two references can be combined to meet the limitations of claim 1. Landsman teaches advertising delivery while Cragun teaches object blocking. Neither Landsman nor Cragun teaches how an advertising provider can go in and reconfigure Cragun's object blocker. For example, it is not clear how Cragun's object blocker, which is running in a client computer, can be reconfigured or disabled by an advertising provider, which is remotely delivering advertising over the Internet. Clarification from the Examiner as to how the Landsman/Cragun combination may be implemented is respectfully requested.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination. Claims 2-5 depend on claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-5 are patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, as well as because of the combination of features set forth in these claims and in claim 1. Examples of why claims 2-5 are separately patentable are discussed below.

Claim 2 recites "removing the window-blocking mechanism from the computer." A user removing entries from the blocking list of Cragun's browser does not remove the browser itself. Therefore, neither Cragun nor Landsman teaches removal of a window blocking mechanism. Furthermore, there is no teaching in either reference as to how a remote advertising provider such as Landsman can go in and add entries to Cragun's blocking list.

Claim 3 recites “removing a component of the window-blocking mechanism from the computer.” A user configuring the blocking list of Cragun’s browser does not remove components of the object blocker. Therefore, neither Cragun nor Landsman teaches removal of a component of a window-blocking mechanism. Furthermore, there is no teaching in either reference as to how a remote advertising provider such as Landsman can remove entries from Cragun’s blocking list.

Claim 4 recites “altering a component of the window-blocking mechanism.” In Cragun, a user can add and remove entries to a blocking list but does not alter any components of the browser itself. Therefore, neither Cragun nor Landsman teaches alteration of components of a window-blocking mechanism. Furthermore, there is no teaching in either reference as to how a remote advertising provider such as Landsman can alter components of Cragun’s object blocker.

Claim 5 recites “closing the window-blocking mechanism.” In Cragun, a user configuring the browser is not closing the object blocker. The browser still runs thereafter and is thus definitely not closed. Therefore, neither Cragun nor Landsman teaches closing window-blocking mechanism in response to detection of the window blocking mechanism (see Claim 1). Furthermore, there is no teaching in either reference as to how a remote advertising provider such as Landsman can close Cragun’s object blocker.

Claim 6 is patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination at least for reciting: “launching a new window in the computer, the computer including a window-blocking mechanism; and preventing the window from being blocked by the window-blocking mechanism.” As discussed above, the Landsman/Cragun combination does not disclose preventing a window from being blocked by a window-blocking mechanism.

Claims 7-29 directly or indirectly depend on claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-29 are patentable at least for the same reasons that claim 6 is patentable, as well as because of the combination of features set forth in these claims and in claim 6. Examples of why claims 7-29 are separately patentable are discussed below.

Claim 7 recites “preventing the window from being blocked while the computer is coupled to the Internet.” A user configuring Cragun’s blocking list may only prevent

blocking of objects in a window, not the window itself while the computer is coupled to the Internet.

Claim 8 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes incorporating a non-functional feature on the window.” Cragun in col. 10, lines 27-37, cited in the last office action, does not disclose or suggest incorporating a non-functional feature on the window. Note that the non-functional feature is incorporated on the window that is being prevented from being blocked. Cragun’s browser does not add features, let alone non-functional features, on delivered windows such as those provided by Landsman. The user cannot incorporate features on Landsman’s windows either. Landsman does not disclose or suggest adding non-functional features on its windows.

Claims 9-12 recites various embodiments for incorporating a non-functional feature on the window that is being prevented from being blocked. The last office action, in essence, rejects these claims based on the argument that the user can “make active or inactive the blocking functions on a window.” It is respectfully submitted that the user employing Cragun’s browser cannot add non-functional features on the window that is being prevented from being blocked. That is, the user of Cragun’s browser cannot incorporate (i.e., add) a non-functional attribute, a non-functional menu bar, a non-functional tool bar, a non-functional field, a non-functional login field, or a non-functional password field on windows delivered by Landsman. Landsman also does not disclose or suggest adding these non-functional features on its windows.

Claim 13 recites that the non-functional feature includes a non-functional login field, while claim 14 recites that the non-functional feature includes a non-functional password field. The last office action suggests that “it is inherent that identification and authentication fields are required when accessing Internet resources.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this conclusion. Inherency requires the feature being proposed to be necessarily in the prior art. This is not the case here because Landsman delivers advertisements to client computers – advertisements are pushed to the client computer without authentication. More importantly, claims 13 and 14 require non-functional (i.e., a dummy) fields. It is respectfully submitted that authentication systems require functional login and password fields.

Claim 15 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes repeatedly manipulating a characteristic of the window.” Cragun, in col. 16, line 37 to col. 17, line 19, cited in the last office action, does not disclose any repeated (i.e., more than once) manipulation of a characteristic of a window to prevent that window from being blocked. The cited section of Cragun talks about blocking windows not preventing windows from being blocked.

Claim 16 recites “wherein repeatedly manipulating a characteristic of the window includes repeatedly turning ON a visibility attribute of the window.” In Cragun, the user does not repeatedly turn ON a feature of the window to prevent the window from being blocked.

Claim 17 recites “wherein repeatedly manipulating a characteristic of the window includes repeatedly positioning the window in a screen location viewable by a user.” Landsman does not repeatedly position its windows in a screen location viewable by a user to prevent the window from being blocked.

Claim 18 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes delaying the launching of the window.” Cragun col. 10, lines 35-37 and FIG. 7b, cited in the last office action, does not discuss delaying the launching of a window, such as Landsman’s, to prevent that window from being blocked. That section of Cragun merely talks about a delay before a window is displayed. Note that the window is still displayed albeit delayed (i.e., the window is not blocked).

Claim 19 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes using a part of a domain name in a URL of the window, wherein the window is not served from a server computer corresponding to the domain name.” Cragun col. 10, lines 27-37, cited in the last office action does not talk about using a part of a domain name in a URL of the window (which is prevented from being blocked), wherein the window is not served from a server computer corresponding to the domain name.

Claim 20 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes intercepting an event to close the window and then hiding the window from a user’s view.” Cragun col. 10, lines 27-37, cited in the last office action, does not talk about intercepting any event, let alone hiding the window from the user’s view to prevent the window from being blocked.

Claim 21 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes momentarily changing a status bar of a browser to reflect a URL of the window.”

Neither Landsman nor Cragun discloses or suggests momentarily changing the status bar of a browser to reflect as URL of the window that is being prevented from being blocked.

Claim 22 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes inputting keystroke combinations into a browser.” Landsman in col. 25, lines 12-19, cited in the last office action, generally discusses keyboard and mouse events. That section of Landsman, however, does not disclose or suggest inputting keystroke combination into a browser to prevent a window from being blocked.

Claim 23 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes triggering mouse events.” Landsman in col. 25, lines 12-19, cited in the last office action, generally discusses keyboard and mouse events. That section of Landsman, however, does not disclose or suggest triggering mouse events to prevent a window from being blocked.

Claim 24 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes setting the title bar of the window.” Landsman in col. 13, lines 45-47, cited in the last office action, does not disclose or suggest setting the title bar of a window to prevent that window from being blocked.

Claim 25 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes using a single web server computer having a rotating list of messages to serve the window.” Landsman in col. 15, lines 56-67 and col. 21, lines 323-35, does not disclose or suggest using a single web server computer having a rotating list of messages to serve the window that is being prevented from being blocked. Landsman does not disclose or suggest anything relating to preventing a window from being blocked.

Claim 26 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes serving the window from a secure domain.” Landsman in col. 8, lines 21-25, cited in the last office action, talks about LANs but is completely silent on serving the window from a secure domain to prevent it from being blocked. Landsman does not disclose or suggest anything relating to preventing a window from being blocked.

Claim 27 recites “wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes altering a list of the window-blocking mechanism.” Cragun in col. 10, lines 28-37, cited

in the last office action, discloses a block list 310 to block particular objects, not windows. That is, altering block list 310 will not prevent windows from being displayed. Furthermore, block list 310 can only be manually modified by a user, not automatically in response to detection of Cragun's browser.

Claim 28 recites "wherein preventing the window from being blocked includes making the window not responsive to a browser application programming interface (API)." Cragun in col. 10, lines 27-40, cited in the last office action, discusses entering URLs of objects, not windows, to be blocked. Furthermore, there is nothing in that section of Cragun that talks about making the window non-responsive to an API to prevent it from being blocked.

Claim 29 recites "wherein making the window not responsive to a browser API includes setting an attribute of a browser control embedded in the window." Cragun in col. 10, lines 27-40, cited in the last office action, discusses entering URLs of objects, not windows, to be blocked. Furthermore, there is nothing in that section of Cragun that talks about making the window non-responsive to an API to prevent it from being blocked by setting an attribute of a browser control embedded in the window.

Claim 30 is patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination at least for reciting: "computer-readable program code for preventing the window from being blocked by a window-blocking computer program." Neither Landsman nor Cragun discloses or suggests software that prevents a window from being blocked. Landsman discloses advertising delivery, while Cragun discloses a browser with an object blocker. Neither of the two discusses defeating Cragun's browser. Therefore, the combination of Landsman and Cragun fails to meet all the limitations of claim 30. The last office action suggests that is obvious to develop software that would block an advertisement blocker. However, as discussed above, the last office action provides no documentary evidence to support this assertion. Advertisement delivery systems in the prior art do not include mechanisms for defeating window-blockers, and conventional window-blockers do not defeat themselves. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 30 is patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination.

Claims 31-33 depend on claim 30. Therefore, claims 31-33 are patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination at least for the same reasons that claim 30 is

patentable, as well as because of the combination of features set forth in these claims and in claim 30. Applicants have reviewed the rejection of claims 31-33 in the last office action and would like to point out that neither Landsman nor Cragun discloses or suggests defeating a window-blocking computer program. Cragun discloses object blocking, not how to defeat itself.

Claim 34 is patentable over the Landsman/Cragun combination at least for reciting: "displaying the message in a main browser window for a period of time in-between navigations." Landsman discloses advertising delivery, while Cragun discloses object blocking. Neither Landsman nor Cragun discloses or suggests displaying a message in a main browser window for a period of time in-between navigations to prevent the message from being blocked. For example, Cragun does not disclose defeating itself by having Landsman display a message in a main browser window for a period of time in-between navigations.

#### Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408)436-2112 for any questions.

If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-2427.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///



Docket No. 10005.000110  
Response To Office Action  
December 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,  
Mark E. Pennell et al.

Dated: 12/17/2004

*Patrick D. Benedicto*

Patrick D. Benedicto, Reg. No. 40,909  
Okamoto & Benedicto LLP  
P.O. Box 641330  
San Jose, CA 95164  
Tel.: (408)436-2110  
Fax.: (408)436-2114

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 CFR 1.10.			
Signature:	<i>Patrick D. Benedicto</i>		
Typed or Printed Name:	Patrick D. Benedicto	Dated:	December 17, 2004
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			